

KS Part C

FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Executive Summary:

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
kansas spp apr executive summary ffy 2015.pdf	Heather Staab		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e
kansas icc spp apr certification ffy 2015.pdf	Heather Staab		<input type="button" value="R"/> e m o v e

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

As noted in the Kansas monitoring plan and noncompliance procedure included in the state's procedure manual (http://www.ksits.org/guidance_docs.htm), the state has a documented process which verifies each Early Intervention Services (EIS) program, called local tiny-k programs in Kansas, with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and has corrected the individual records, although the actions may have not occurred on a timely basis. Kansas' correction standard requires verification of child-specific correction of noncompliance and that each EIS program or provider is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data reflecting 100% compliance.

All EIS programs are monitored for each indicator. The EIS programs in Kansas are known as the local tiny-k programs.

- Systemic and single-occurrence noncompliance is formally identified and reported through the state's monitoring process. Most noncompliance is evident through data reports generated from the state's infant-toddler services (ITS) database, although in some instances, noncompliance is identified through parent surveys, informal complaints, local/peer feedback, and other periodic reports submitted to the state.
- Following the formal identification, Kansas ITS uses subsequent data reports to ensure that the prescribed corrective action is occurring and is effective.
- In reviewing compliance issues, Kansas ITS tracks data on every child in Kansas by a unique identifier number in the ITS database. No sampling is used to evaluate data in the database. Kansas does have a sampling plan on file with OSEP, but that is only used for periodic random sampling to verify results received through surveys.
- Kansas ITS uses the ITS Database, parent surveys, provider surveys, semi-annual reports, local tiny-k provider Continuous Improvement Plans and Community Service Plans (part of the annual grant application and contract), and other specialized reports to determine noncompliance and to verify correction.
- The monitoring plan includes an instituted process of quarterly reviews of the ITS database by Kansas ITS staff to review all data related to compliance indicators.

Steps regarding corrective action plans and action plan tracking and monitoring over the correction time period are defined. Security processes for electronic documents concerning findings of noncompliance have been established.

Kansas ITS has selected the first two weeks of October as the annual review period for the prior fiscal year (July 1 to June 30). More standardized statewide management reports have been and will continue to be developed using the existing data system.

Kansas ITS's general supervision system is reliant on data collection and reporting. Kansas ITS compiles, analyzes, and reports on all of the data that is submitted by local tiny-k programs. Local data entry personnel are responsible for imputing raw data only. Since Part C in Kansas is structured in a way that promotes local control, data entry personnel are not Kansas ITS employees. Therefore, consistency in reporting is a challenge that Kansas ITS continuously addresses through trainings, data validation techniques, and feedback through state-level reports. In addition, Kansas ITS has reviewed and revised its process of tracking and reporting on findings from the annual outside audits of local tiny-k program's lead agencies. The ability to follow-up on any findings found is included in the process.

Kansas ITS contracts with JNI Software, Inc. to maintain the state's database. The system has been effective in collecting and sorting data for reporting purposes, and improvements made over time have greatly enhanced the state's ability to accurately report all compliance data, and support evidence-based practices. An on-line user manual is included as a function in the database. The manual may also be downloaded by users.

Kansas ITS offers data trainings on a periodic basis, currently annually, and also has a contractor-run assistance phone number established for local tiny-k program data managers. In addition, Kansas ITS' contract with the Kansas Inservice Training System (KITS, the technical assistance contractor) addresses interpretations of data that are input into the infant-toddler database.

Kansas ITS also provides definitions and instruction sheets to local tiny-k programs to assist in the creation of semi-annual reports, federal data tables, and local grant applications. These instruction sheets define the parameters Kansas ITS expects with regards to data entry and report requirements.

Consistency in data entry among local data entry personnel has been and will be addressed through ongoing trainings and technical assistance. Kansas ITS' contract with JNI Software, Inc. offers local tiny-k programs the availability of a database specialist anytime a question arises. Kansas ITS staff frequently addresses data definitions and reporting expectations at quarterly coordinator meetings and as-needed webinars. Local staff turnover remains a concern, as new data entry personnel must be trained in using the infant-toddler database on a periodic basis.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

Technical assistance (TA) is provided through a contract with the University of Kansas. The Kansas Inservice Training System (KITS) a program of the University of Kansas Life Span Institute at Parsons, Kansas provides training and TA to all 36 local Part C programs (as of June 30, 2016. As of July 1, 2016, three local Part C programs merged into other existing local programs, leaving 33 Part C programs as of that date). KITS maintains a website of resources and a listing of available training opportunities: <http://kskits.org/index.shtml>.

KITS is designed to provide a training and resource system for early intervention programs and early childhood special education program staff through collaborative training and technical assistance activities on a comprehensive statewide basis. Additionally, parents and staff of agencies collaborating with these early intervention programs are afforded the opportunity to be involved in all activities associated with specific technical assistance projects. The comprehensive system is realized through four identified system components of collaboration / linkages, information services, training, and technical assistance.

KITS staff assigned to support Kansas ITS and the local tiny-k programs are an integral part of the planning and presentation of coordinator meetings, webinars, and specific trainings. KITS staff attend weekly staff meetings of the Kansas ITS staff as scheduling permits.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The quality of early intervention staff is the single most important determinant of the quality of a program. KDHE and Kansas Infant-Toddler Services (ITS) ensure access to information to address questions and concerns of providers, parents, and primary referral sources through the provision of training, technical assistance, and consultation locally, regionally, or statewide. Referrals to various statewide resources for information and training are also utilized.

The Kansas ITS program participates in an Early Childhood Higher-education Options (ECHO) state work group and works with the state college and university systems to promote the preparation of early intervention service providers who are fully and appropriately qualified upon graduation to provide early intervention services to infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Lead agency personnel are available to make visits to local tiny-k programs, confer by phone, arrange conference calls, and provide written information in response to concerns and requests. In addition, the state's procedure manual can be found on the agency web site for guidance, references, and sources of additional information. Kansas ITS also contracts with The University of Kansas through the Kansas Inservice Training System (KITS) program for additional training and technical assistance.

Specific activities and programs related to a comprehensive system of professional development include but are not limited to the following: (As needs are identified, additional professional development activities are created.)

1) KITS

KITS is a program of the Kansas University Center on Developmental Disabilities at Parsons and is supported through funding from the Kansas ITS at KDHE and the Kansas State Department of Education.

The KITS project is designed to provide a training and resource system through collaborative training and technical assistance activities on a comprehensive statewide basis.

2) Regional and Statewide Meetings

Regional and statewide early intervention meetings are conducted by the Kansas ITS to provide a regular and ongoing means of technical assistance and training to local programs. These meetings may take place face-to-face, by phone conference, or by webinar. A representative of each local tiny-k program is expected to attend.

3) Kansas Resource Guide

This resource guide is a toll-free help line and web site available to families, providers, referral sources, and others to provide information concerning resources, or to refer calls to a person who can provide the necessary information. The phone line is answered from 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday on regularly scheduled work days.

4) Families Together, Inc.

Families Together, Inc., (FTI) is a parent training and information center serving families of children and youth with disabilities from birth through age twenty-one. Parents and professionals can find publications, workshops, and other resources to help make decisions about education, vocational training, employment, and other services for their children with disabilities.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

5) Participation in the Early Childhood Personnel Center

Kansas is currently engaged with the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC) in intensive technical assistance (TA). Utilizing the [ECTA System Framework](#) as a guide, ECPC is assisting Kansas in evaluating, modifying, and improving state service delivery systems. ECPC provides Kansas technical assistance focusing on the Personnel/Workforce Component of the ECTA System Framework.

Intensive TA is a strategic planning process designed to develop a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development that focuses specifically on (a) enhancing knowledge and skills of practitioners, and those who support them, including administrators, TA providers, and faculty; (b) supporting the implementation and sustainability of evidence-based practices; and (c) increasing the size of the workforce skilled in providing inclusive intervention practices.

6) Other Personnel Development Resources

Kansas Coordinating Council on Early Childhood Developmental Services

Sound Beginnings (Kansas Newborn Hearing Screening Program)

The Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA Center)

The Technical Assistance System Network

Assistive Technology for Kansans

KSITS Database User Manual

Sound START (Kansas State School for the Deaf)

Kansas Deaf-Blind Project

Kansas Autism and Tertiary Behavior Supports (KISN)

Kansas State School for the Blind

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Opportunities for broad stakeholder input to assist in reviewing all aspects of the SPP/APR were provided through webinars, state-wide conferences, four quarterly Infant-Toddler local tiny-k coordinator/family service coordinator meetings, public comment opportunities and hearings held regarding the revised procedure manual, and a review of the documents by Kansas' State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Stakeholder representatives on the SICC included parents, local tiny-k service providers, local tiny-k coordinators, the Governor's office, the Kansas State Department of Education, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Kansas Department for Children and Families (formerly known as the Department for Social and Rehabilitation Services), Head Start, Early Head Start, Kansas Insurance Commission, Parents As Teachers, members of the Kansas Senate and House of Representatives, personnel representing Kansas universities, and public members.

For the 2013 resetting and potential revision of targets, Kansas ITS presented information and solicited input at two local tiny-k coordinator meetings, at the state Early Childhood Leadership Team, at a meeting of the Family Advocacy Council for the Special Health Services section of KDHE, through e-mails on a state listserv for local coordinators, and has engaged a specific SPP/APR work group of the SICC.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

Complete copies of Kansas' SPP/APR are available on the KDHE Part C ITS website at <http://www.ksits.org/publications.htm>. The SPP/APR is reviewed by the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), and a final copy is provided to the SICC for its use. The most current SPP/APR will be posted to the program website not later than 120 days following the submission of Kansas' APR to OSEP as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A). The data on the performance for each EIS program with regard to the SPP/APR targets can also be accessed at the above link. These performance reports are also posted within 120 days following the submission of Kansas' APR. Local program determinations and data sheets outlining program trends over time on an annual basis are both found on the ITS website. Other public information is available at other times by request.

Attachments

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name

Uploaded By

Uploaded Date

No APR attachments found.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		93.60%	98.90%	99.50%	99.50%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
4769	4769	100%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0
---	---

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The full reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 was used to determine the data reported.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The data is the full data set from the Kansas ITS database for the complete reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016. So, by definition, the data is an accurate reflection.

The records are for children eligible for Part C with active IFSPs with an initial or review date within the reporting period. There were 8,076 initial or review IFSPs tracked for the reporting period for 4,769 children. Timely service is defined as within 30 calendar days or less from the date of consent for services documented in the IFSP, or records with documented delays due to exceptional family circumstances.

All 36 local tiny-k programs (as of June 30, 2016, three programs merged with others effective July 1, 2016) were in compliance during FFY2015.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Historically, Kansas has conducted a randomly-selected biennial parent survey that includes a question regarding services start dates. The survey was conducted in the Fall of 2015 for the prior service year of July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015. On this survey, 92.8% of responding parents reported that services began within 30 days of IFSP development. It is possible the discrepancy between the survey data and the data obtained through the database (100%) is due to parents not recognizing family service coordination as a program service. This service most typically begins concurrent with the IFSP development. At this time, the state is still reviewing the continuation of this biennial parent survey in lieu of the full implementation of the Family Outcome Survey - Revised, FOS-R, which is a more statistically sound instrument.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

OSEP Response

--

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data		98.20%	98.40%	98.60%	98.50%	99.20%	99.50%	99.70%	99.60%	99.68%	99.81%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Opportunities for broad stakeholder input to assist in reviewing all aspects of the SPP/APR were provided through webinars, state-wide conferences, four annual Infant-Toddler local tiny-k coordinator/family service coordinator meetings, public comment opportunities and hearings held regarding the revised procedure manual, and a review of the documents by Kansas' State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Stakeholder representatives on the SICC included parents, local tiny-k service providers, local tiny-k coordinators, the Governor's office, the Kansas State Department of Education, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Kansas Department for Children and Families (formerly known as the Department for Social and Rehabilitation Services), Head Start, Early Head Start, Kansas Insurance Commission, Parents As Teachers, members of the Kansas Senate and House of Representatives, personnel representing Kansas universities, and public members.

For the FFY 2013 resetting of targets and potential revision of baseline data, Kansas ITS presented information and solicited input at two local tiny-k coordinator meetings, at the Kansas State Agencies Early Childhood Leadership Team, at a meeting of the Family Advocacy Council for the Special Health Services section of KDHE, and has engaged a specific SPP/APR work group of the SICC for review of all aspects of the SPP/APR.

Since performance has remained at a relatively high level since 2005, Kansas has kept its targets at 95%.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	4,759	
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	4,769	

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
4,759	4,769	99.81%	95.00%	99.79%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The concept of services in a natural environment is one highly stressed by Kansas over a number of years. Local tiny-k programs are required to review the provision of services in natural environments during the annual grant application process by filing a Continuous Improvement Plan focused on the service delivery model. Programs are also required to provide a community service plan addressing the mission and key principles of early intervention services, and use a statewide IFSP format which includes requirement to describe service provision in a natural environment or to provide justification for the few services or instances where that may not be possible.

Kansas was conservative in resetting targets. The 36 local programs represent a spectrum of rural and urban locations, and large and small communities. The

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

annual census of children served per program ranges from less than 10 to over 1,500. Progress seen at a state level is not always experienced at the local level. The conservative targets will allow programs in communities with more challenging situations the opportunity to set reasonable goals toward achieving improvements and meeting targets at the local level.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? **No**

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2009	Target ≥						68.48%	57.53%	57.63%	57.73%	57.80%	57.90%
		Data					68.48%	57.43%	58.77%	65.44%	68.62%	69.47%	70.24%
A2	2013	Target ≥						63.62%	56.33%	56.43%	56.53%	51.36%	51.36%
		Data					63.62%	56.23%	53.92%	55.99%	55.29%	51.36%	52.23%
B1	2009	Target ≥						70.76%	61.14%	61.24%	61.34%	61.40%	61.50%
		Data					70.76%	61.04%	64.12%	68.06%	70.66%	72.21%	74.75%
B2	2013	Target ≥						54.80%	47.44%	47.54%	47.64%	50.18%	50.18%
		Data					54.80%	47.34%	48.18%	49.67%	50.35%	50.18%	51.80%
C1	2009	Target ≥						73.23%	66.99%	67.09%	67.19%	67.30%	67.40%
		Data					73.23%	66.89%	66.36%	71.45%	74.54%	75.65%	76.52%
C2	2013	Target ≥						69.11%	63.44%	63.54%	63.64%	61.91%	61.91%
		Data					69.11%	63.34%	61.64%	63.44%	64.29%	61.91%	61.73%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	58.00%	58.10%	58.20%	58.30%
Target A2 ≥	51.40%	51.40%	51.45%	51.45%
Target B1 ≥	61.60%	61.70%	61.80%	61.90%
Target B2 ≥	50.20%	50.20%	50.25%	50.25%
Target C1 ≥	67.50%	67.60%	67.70%	67.80%
Target C2 ≥	61.95%	61.95%	62.00%	62.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Opportunities for broad stakeholder input to assist in reviewing all aspects of the SPP/APR were provided through webinars, state-wide conferences, four annual Infant-Toddler local tiny-k coordinator/family service coordinator meetings, public comment opportunities and hearings held regarding the revised procedure manual, and a review of the documents by Kansas' State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Stakeholder representatives on the SICC included parents, local tiny-k service providers, local tiny-k coordinators, the Governor's office, the Kansas State Department of Education, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Kansas Department for Children and Families (formerly known as the Department for Social and Rehabilitation Services), Head Start, Early Head Start, Kansas Insurance Commission, Parents As Teachers, members of the Kansas Senate and House of Representatives, personnel representing Kansas universities, and public members.

For the 2013 resetting and potential revision of targets, Kansas ITS presented information and solicited input at two local tiny-k coordinator meetings, at the Kansas State Agencies Early Childhood Leadership Team, at a meeting of the Family Advocacy Council for the Special Health Services section of KDHE, through e-mails on a state listserve for local coordinators, and has engaged a specific SPP/APR work group of the SICC.

Kansas has been conservative in resetting targets. Comments received from stakeholders reinforced the knowledge that the 36 local programs represent a spectrum of rural and urban locations, and large and small communities. Historically, the annual census of children served per program ranges from less than 10 to over 1,500. Progress seen at a state level is not always experienced at the local level. The conservative targets will allow programs in communities with more challenging situations the opportunity to set reasonable goals toward achieving improvements and meeting targets at the local level.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	2843.00
--	---------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	381.00	13.40%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	432.00	15.20%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	551.00	19.38%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	986.00	34.68%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	493.00	17.34%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1537.00	2350.00	70.24%	58.00%	65.40%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1479.00	2843.00	52.23%	51.40%	52.02%

Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	334.00	11.75%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	421.00	14.81%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	587.00	20.65%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1097.00	38.59%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	404.00	14.21%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1684.00	2439.00	74.75%	61.60%	69.04%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1501.00	2843.00	51.80%	50.20%	52.80%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	260.00	9.15%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	396.00	13.93%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	480.00	16.88%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1155.00	40.63%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	552.00	19.42%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$.	1635.00	2291.00	76.52%	67.50%	71.37%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$.	1707.00	2843.00	61.73%	61.95%	60.04%

Explanation of C2 Slippage

Of the 36 programs in existence during FFY 15, 14 had slippage in this portion of Indicator 3. This is attributed to more frequent focused and issue-specific training on Early Childhood Outcomes, and on use of the COSF when integrated into the IFSP, provided to most local tiny-k programs during FFY 15.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Emphasis on inter-rater reliability between staff members on all of the ECO outcomes was part of this training. There was some regression in five of the six portions of Indicator 3 due to this work, but only C2 failed to meet the previously set target.

Due to continuing changes in staffing at the local level, and to the merger of three local programs into other existing local programs resulting in 33 programs at the beginning of FFY 16, Kansas has chosen to not reset the baseline for Indicator 3 - C2 at this time. All portions of Indicator 3 will be reviewed next year to better judge the effects of the training process and structural changes at the local level, and the further effects of the COSF integration into the IFSP at the state level.

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Outcomes data was available on 2,843 children during the FFY15 reporting period, an increase of .47% over 2014 data. This small increase is attributed to continued systems improvements in collection of child outcomes, and tracking of children either transferring or otherwise served for less than six months in a Kansas Part C local program.

Kansas has incorporated the COSF outcomes into the IFSP and instituted annual collection of COSF information, which had previously been collected only at entrance and exit. Currently, the IFSP is available in a web-based format, and if used in that manner, the IFSP auto-populates the COSF information into the ITS database.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4: Family Involvement**

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2015	Target ≥			70.00%	75.00%	80.00%	80.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	90.51%
		Data			57.80%	62.80%	98.10%	96.80%	99.50%	99.50%	99.55%	99.39%	90.51%
B	2015	Target ≥			95.00%	96.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	97.30%	94.18%
		Data			97.20%	98.40%	94.40%	92.90%	97.00%	95.50%	96.66%	96.42%	94.18%
C	2015	Target ≥			97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	97.10%	92.14%
		Data			97.00%	97.90%	97.60%	96.20%	97.30%	96.10%	97.26%	96.60%	92.14%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	88.47%	88.50%	88.50%	88.55%
Target B ≥	91.83%	91.85%	91.85%	91.90%
Target C ≥	91.30%	91.30%	91.30%	91.35%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

KDHE ITS retired it's older, locally developed family survey form effective July 1, 2014 and adopted the ECO Family Outcomes Survey - Revised (FOS-R) as a more psychometrically sound survey tool available in multiple languages.

In FFY 2014, one hundred and ninety-nine of the old family surveys (24%) and six hundred and twenty five FOS-R surveys (76%) were received and recorded. In FFY 2015, six of the old surveys (.9%), and six hundred seventy-four of the FOS-R surveys (99.1%) were received and recorded. As of FFY 2015, the older survey was almost completely phased out. Data reported for both years reflects a blending of both surveys.

The Kansas results on the FOS-R survey are considerably lower than those on the older entrance-exit survey, which was expected. Kansas' FOS-R results are also more aligned with those found nationally, therefore, the state chose to re-set baseline levels in both years to the data obtained during each year, as anticipated in last year's SPP/APR, when it was expected that nearly 100% of returned surveys would be the FOS-R.

In FFY 2015 and into the future, only the FOS-R survey will be used in Kansas. The number of returned surveys may be lower than in previous years because the survey is provided to families only once while they are receiving services, and the old survey had been provided twice. In addition, Kansas ITS anticipates that the performance ratings may continue to lower slightly in the future and become more aligned with the ratings seen nationally for states using the FOS-R.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Opportunities for broad stakeholder input to assist in reviewing all aspects of the SPP/APR were provided through webinars, state-wide conferences, four annual Infant-Toddler local tiny-k coordinator/family service coordinator meetings, public comment opportunities and hearings held regarding the revised procedure manual, and a review of the documents by Kansas' State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Stakeholder representatives on the SICC included parents, local tiny-k service providers, local tiny-k coordinators, the Governor's office, the Kansas State Department of Education, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Kansas Department for Children and Families (formerly known as the Department for Social and Rehabilitation Services), Head Start, Early Head Start, Kansas Insurance Commission, Parents As Teachers, members of the Kansas Senate and House of Representatives, personnel representing Kansas universities, and public members.

For the FFY 2013 resetting and potential revision of targets, Kansas ITS presented information and solicited input at two local tiny-k coordinator meetings, at the Kansas State Agencies Early Childhood Leadership Team, at a meeting of the Family Advocacy Council for the Special Health Services section of KDHE, and has engaged a specific SPP/APR work group of the SICC. Multiple listserv announcements regarding work being done on target development, and soliciting input, were sent to local tiny-k coordinators, interested stakeholder, and the SICC work group.

For the FFY 2014 resetting and revision of targets for this indicator, Kansas ITS presented the first year's implementation data and solicited input from the same stakeholder groups, who were in agreement to reset the baseline and targets based on the July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015 data. The input included presentations and discussions through webinars, state-wide conferences, annual local tiny-k coordinator/family service coordinator meetings, public comment opportunities and a review of the documents by Kansas' State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). These entities were also informed of the potential additional revision of these targets as full implementation of the Family Outcomes Survey was achieved.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The stakeholders were informed in FFY2014 of the possibility of continued revision of targets as new data was collected. Results of the new data was presented to stakeholders, and the need for target revision was presented.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	674.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	537.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	607.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	573.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	624.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	567.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	621.00

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	90.51%	88.47%	88.47%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	94.18%	91.83%	91.83%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	92.14%	91.30%	91.30%

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

During FFY 2015 two family surveys were collected within the Kansas ITS program.

The locally-developed family survey form is a state-designed entrance/exit survey, in use for many years. Data was collected on a continuous basis, with surveys originally designed to be distributed by local tiny-k programs to all families with children receiving services in Part C immediately following the development of the initial IFSP, and again during the transition process. In FFY 2015, no copies of the old form should have been provided to families, however, because of the small but existant amount of returned older forms, the data was collected and analyzed. Each time an older form was received by KDHE ITS, the local program was contacted to ensure that only new forms were being distributed. It is also possible that older forms were distributed after July 1, 2014 (the stated phase-out date for the older survey) but sent in at a later date. Only six of these older surveys were received during FFY 2015, so the phase-out appears to be nearly complete.

The ECO FOS-R is a nationally recognized, psychometrically sound tool first adopted by Kansas ITS on July 1, 2014. The FOS-R was adopted due to its excellent psychometric properties and availability in multiple languages. Kansas ITS anticipated that beginning in FFY 2015, it would be the sole tool used to gather family input. It is distributed to families by local program staff after the child has been in services for 6 months, likely at a 6-month IFSP review or at the transition conference, whichever happens first. Families receive a self-addressed stamped envelope to mail the survey directly to KDHE ITS, and local programs may assist families in mailing in the form.

The biennial family survey was conducted in the fall of 2015 by sending a survey to 462 randomly selected families with active IFSPs. The biennial survey is similar to the locally-developed family survey form and has been used to verify the entrance-exit results in the past. Due to the sound psychometrics of the FOS-R, Kansas ITS is considering retiring the biennial family survey process. Those results were reported last year.

Based on a review of the percent of returns, a comparison of children and families served to the percent of returned surveys by local program, and those surveys returned in alternative languages as compared to the languages spoken by families served, it is believed the response group for each survey is generally representative of the population served.

National data on the ECO FOS-R for FFY 2012 published on the ECTA Center website in September, 2014 indicate the national averages reported by states at 87% for knowing their rights, 88% for effectively communicating their children's needs and 90% for helping their children develop and grow. Kansas has historically obtained higher percentages on both their locally generated entrance/exit survey and the additional biennial survey. However, Kansas' proposed baseline data obtained in FFY 2015 are closer to the national averages and have been obtained on a more psychometrically sound tool, and with a more complete phase-in for the ECO FOS-R.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

KDHE ITS retired its older, locally developed family survey form effective July 1, 2014 and adopted the ECO Family Outcomes Survey - Revised (FOS-R) as a more psychometrically sound survey tool available in multiple languages.

In FFY 2015, six of the old family surveys (.9%) and six hundred and seventy-four FOS-R surveys (99.1%) were received and recorded. The FFY 2015 data reflects a blending of the two surveys. The Kansas results on the FOS-R survey are notably lower than those on the older entrance-exit survey, which was expected. Kansas' FOS-R results are also more aligned with those found nationally, therefore, the state chose to re-set baseline levels to the data obtained this year (FFY 15), as anticipated in last year's SPP/APR.

In FFY 2015 and into the future, only the FOS-R survey will be used in Kansas. The number of returned surveys may be lower than in previous years because the survey is provided to families only once while they are receiving services, and the old survey had been provided twice. In addition, Kansas ITS anticipates that the performance ratings may continue lower slightly in the future and become more aligned with the ratings seen nationally for states using the FOS-R.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2015, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			1.30%	1.33%	1.35%	1.35%	1.35%	1.35%	1.35%	1.40%	1.40%
Data		1.21%	1.43%	1.38%	1.30%	1.35%	1.47%	1.56%	1.74%	1.73%	1.80%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.45%	1.45%	1.50%	1.50%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Opportunities for broad stakeholder input to assist in reviewing all aspects of the SPP/APR were provided through webinars, state-wide conferences, four annual Infant-Toddler local tiny-k coordinator/family service coordinator meetings, public comment opportunities and hearings held regarding the revised procedure manual, and a review of the documents by Kansas' State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Stakeholder representatives on the SICC included parents, local tiny-k service providers, local tiny-k coordinators, the Governor's office, the Kansas State Department of Education, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Kansas Department for Children and Families (formerly known as the Department for Social and Rehabilitation Services), Head Start, Early Head Start, Kansas Insurance Commission, Parents As Teachers, members of the Kansas Senate and House of Representatives, personnel representing Kansas universities, and public members.

For the FFY 2013 resetting and potential revision of targets, Kansas ITS presented information and solicited input at two local tiny-k coordinator meetings, at the Kansas State Agencies Early Childhood Leadership Team, at a meeting of the Family Advocacy Council for the Special Health Services section of KDHE, and has engaged a specific SPP/APR work group of the SICC.

Kansas has been conservative in resetting targets. Comments received from stakeholders reinforced the knowledge that the 36 local programs represent a wide spectrum of rural and urban locations, and relatively large and small communities. The annual census of children served per program ranges from less than 10 to over 1,500. Progress seen at a state level is not always experienced at the local level. The conservative targets will allow programs in communities with more challenging situations the opportunity to set reasonable goals toward achieving improvements and meeting targets at the local level.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	716	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	38,972	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
716	38,972	1.80%	1.45%	1.84%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Comparison to National Data

For the last several years, Kansas' performance on this indicator has exceeded the national mean value, based on a review of data from the ECTA center. For the 2015-2016 period, Kansas ranks 10th out of the 51 reporting jurisdictions when ranked by highest percentage served to lowest percentage served. The state 1/25/2018

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

performed above the national average of state (including the District of Columbia) performance percentages of 1.41% and the mathematical national mean of 1.20%. The 1.84% figure is an improvement over last year's performance, even though the state dropped one rank from last year.

Number and percent¹ of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by age and state: 2015²

State	# served birth to 1	# birth to 1 in pop	% birth to 1 in pop
1 Massachusetts	3,338	73,100	4.57
2 New Mexico	984	26,407	3.73
3 West Virginia	576	20,658	2.79
4 Wyoming	214	7,677	2.79
5 Rhode Island	304	11,065	2.75
6 New Hampshire	316	12,784	2.47
7 Pennsylvania	3,138	141,872	2.21
8 North Dakota	215	11,144	1.93
9 Alaska	217	11,383	1.91
10 Kansas	716	38,972	1.84
11 Vermont	105	5,994	1.75
12 Idaho	376	22,649	1.66
13 Maryland	1,176	72,907	1.61
14 Arkansas	587	37,698	1.56
15 Iowa	615	39,518	1.56
16 Virginia	1,515	102,863	1.47
17 Washington	1,314	89,440	1.47
18 District of Columbia	128	9,153	1.40
19 Indiana	1,135	83,603	1.36
20 Connecticut	490	36,486	1.34
21 Delaware	147	11,020	1.33
22 Louisiana	810	62,686	1.29
23 Missouri	943	74,779	1.26
24 South Dakota	157	12,419	1.26
25 Illinois	1,931	155,304	1.24
26 Nevada	444	35,737	1.24
27 New York	2,808	238,315	1.18
28 North Carolina	1,375	120,576	1.14
29 Michigan	1,292	114,061	1.13
30 Montana	135	12,601	1.07
31 Georgia	1,368	130,327	1.05
32 Wisconsin	693	66,978	1.03
33 Utah	515	50,821	1.01
34 Ohio	1,355	139,055	0.97
35 Minnesota	666	70,248	0.95
36 Texas	3,759	399,149	0.94
37 California	4,685	501,336	0.93
38 Tennessee	743	80,549	0.92
39 Oregon	420	46,266	0.91
40 Arizona	767	86,440	0.89
41 Hawaii	162	19,028	0.85
42 Colorado	568	67,322	0.84
43 Nebraska	209	26,178	0.80
44 New Jersey	784	103,853	0.75
45 South Carolina	431	57,927	0.74
46 Alabama	412	58,017	0.71
47 Florida	1,538	221,492	0.69
48 Oklahoma	359	53,581	0.67
49 Maine	80	12,863	0.62
50 Kentucky	316	55,564	0.57
51 Mississippi	216	38,173	0.57
American Samoa	10	-	-
Guam	48	-	-
Northern Marianas	6	-	-
Puerto Rico	221	-	-
Virgin Islands	16	-	-
U.S. and Outlying Areas	47,848	3,978,038	1.20

Sources: U.S. Department of Education, ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS): "IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey" 2015. Data extracted as of July 14, 2016. U.S. Bureau of the Census. "2015 State Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin". Data accessed July 2016 from <http://www.census.gov/popest>

Note: Additional collection information and data available at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/index.html>

¹Percent = Number of infants and toddlers in the specified age category served under IDEA, Part C, divided by the number of infants and toddlers in the specified age category in the estimated U.S. resident population multiplied by 100.

²Note: These data are a snapshot count collected by states in the fall of the identified year.

- Data not available x Data suppressed due to small cell size * Data flagged due to questionable data quality

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			2.80%	2.85%	2.90%	2.90%	2.90%	2.90%	2.90%	3.00%	3.00%
Data		2.52%	2.63%	2.71%	2.75%	2.84%	3.20%	3.42%	3.54%	3.67%	3.89%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	3.10%	3.10%	3.20%	3.20%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Opportunities for broad stakeholder input to assist in reviewing all aspects of the SPP/APR were provided through webinars, state-wide conferences, four annual Infant-Toddler local tiny-k coordinator/family service coordinator meetings, public comment opportunities and hearings held regarding the revised procedure manual, and a review of the documents by Kansas' State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Stakeholder representatives on the SICC included parents, local tiny-k service providers, local tiny-k coordinators, the Governor's office, the Kansas State Department of Education, the Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE), Kansas Department for Children and Families (formerly known as the Department for Social and Rehabilitation Services), Head Start, Early Head Start, Kansas Insurance Commission, Parents As Teachers, members of the Kansas Senate and House of Representatives, personnel representing Kansas universities, and public members.

For the FFY 2013 resetting and potential revision of targets, Kansas ITS presented information and solicited input at two local tiny-k coordinator meetings, at the Kansas State Agencies Early Childhood Leadership Team, at a meeting of the Family Advocacy Council for the Special Health Services section of KDHE, and has engaged a specific SPP/APR work group of the SICC.

Kansas has been conservative in resetting targets. Comments received from stakeholders reinforced the knowledge that the 36 local programs represent a wide spectrum of rural and urban locations, and both relatively large and small communities. The annual census of children served per program ranges from less than 10 to over 1,500. Progress seen at a state level is not always experienced at the local level. The conservative targets will allow programs in communities with more challenging situations the opportunity to set reasonable goals toward achieving improvements and meeting targets at the local level.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	4,769	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	117,885	

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
4,769	117,885	3.89%	3.10%	4.05%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Comparison to National Data

For the last several years, Kansas' performance on this indicator has exceeded the national mean value, based on a review of data from the ECTA center. Based on this data, Kansas is ranked 11th out of the 31 reporting jurisdictions when sorted from highest percentage served to lowest percentage served. Kansas also performed above the national average of state (including the District of Columbia) performance percentages of 3.26% and the national

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

mathematical mean of 3.00%. This compares favorably to Kansas' performance in FFY 2014, with a ranking improvement of one position.

Number and percent¹ of infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services under IDEA, Part C, by age and state: 2015²

	State	Number served birth through age 2	Number birth through 2 in pop	Percentage birth through age 2 population
1	Massachusetts	19,808	218,988	9.05
2	New Mexico	5,414	80,110	6.76
3	Rhode Island	2,016	32,985	6.11
4	Wyoming	1,256	23,012	5.46
5	West Virginia	3,260	62,137	5.25
6	New Hampshire	2,001	38,390	5.21
7	Vermont	896	18,079	4.96
8	Pennsylvania	18,773	427,075	4.40
9	Connecticut	4,726	110,667	4.27
10	New York	30,025	711,133	4.22
11	Kansas	4,769	117,885	4.05
12	New Jersey	12,491	314,191	3.98
13	Indiana	9,756	251,036	3.89
14	North Dakota	1,222	32,590	3.75
15	Maryland	7,798	219,479	3.55
16	Illinois	15,292	466,889	3.28
17	Delaware	1,060	33,099	3.20
18	South Dakota	1,174	37,086	3.17
19	Colorado	6,297	200,797	3.14
20	Hawaii	1,740	56,025	3.11
21	Nevada	3,163	105,721	2.99
22	Virginia	9,169	308,543	2.97
23	District of Columbia	784	26,599	2.95
24	Iowa	3,448	118,486	2.91
25	Idaho	1,931	67,641	2.85
26	Wisconsin	5,760	202,120	2.85
27	North Carolina	10,172	361,530	2.81
28	Utah	4,159	151,490	2.75
29	Kentucky	4,498	167,081	2.69
30	Washington	7,207	268,261	2.69
31	California	40,138	1,499,889	2.68
32	Missouri	5,928	224,404	2.64
33	Minnesota	5,524	210,833	2.62
34	Oregon	3,614	138,213	2.61
35	Michigan	8,901	342,155	2.60
36	Alaska	871	33,649	2.59
37	Louisiana	4,720	187,391	2.52
38	Ohio	10,195	416,763	2.45
39	Georgia	9,213	390,996	2.36
40	Maine	908	38,725	2.34
41	South Carolina	3,978	172,735	2.30
42	Arizona	5,391	257,566	2.09
43	Tennessee	5,018	240,919	2.08
44	Nebraska	1,619	78,546	2.06
45	Texas	24,270	1,191,566	2.04
46	Florida	13,056	658,773	1.98
47	Montana	721	37,356	1.93
48	Alabama	3,190	174,392	1.83
49	Oklahoma	2,818	160,857	1.75
50	Arkansas	1,977	113,736	1.74
51	Mississippi	1,966	114,596	1.72
	American Samoa	35	-	-
	Guam	187	-	-
	Northern Marianas	53	-	-
	Puerto Rico	3,238	-	-
	Virgin Islands	121	-	-
	U.S. and Outlying Areas	357,715	11,913,185	3.00

Sources: U.S. Department of Education, ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS): "IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey," 2015. Data extracted as of July 14, 2016. U.S. Bureau of the Census. "2015 State Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin". Data accessed July 2016 from <http://www.census.gov/popest>

Note: Additional collection information and data available at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/osepidea/618-data/index.html>

¹Percent = Number of infants and toddlers in the specified age category served under IDEA, Part C, divided by the number of infants and toddlers in the specified age category in the estimated U.S. resident population multiplied by 100.

²Note: These data are a snapshot count collected by states in the fall of the identified year.

- Data not available x Data suppressed due to small cell size * Data flagged due to questionable data quality

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		97.30%	99.10%	99.30%	99.70%	98.80%	99.60%	99.70%	99.90%	99.98%	99.86%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
4,204	4,961	99.86%	100%	99.90%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	752
--	-----

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The data is for the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

The full reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 was used for collection, with all records included, so the data is by definition an accurate reflection.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 15, there were five instances of a late IFSP without an exceptional family circumstance across five EIS programs. Each program received a finding of noncompliance or a finding and release letter, based on a review of subsequent data from the ITS database. Each of the five families did have an IFSP provided, albeit late. Correction was verified on each of the five records through a data review.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

As noted in the monitoring plan and noncompliance procedure, revised in September 2014, the state has a documented process which verifies each EIS program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data from the state data system, and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Kansas ITS determines this to be true through the following process:

- o Noncompliance is formally identified and reported through the state’s monitoring process. Most noncompliance is evident through data reports generated from the state’s infant-toddler database, or through the semi-annual report process. In some instances, noncompliance is identified through parent surveys, complaints, local/peer feedback, and related data reports.
- o Following the formal identification and finding, findings letters are issued, generally accompanied by the requirement to enter into a corrective action plan. These plans can include imposition of the submission of monthly reports on changes implemented, the requirement to perform a root cause analysis, and/or submission of new internal policies or procedures to ensure compliance. Kansas ITS monitors a series of subsequent data reports to ensure that the prescribed corrective action is occurring and is effective.
- o After identification of noncompliance, the data for each local program is cross-checked with semi-annual report data, which also identifies specific instances of late IFSP provision.
- o A quarterly review of the infant-toddler database by Kansas ITS staff includes a review of timelines related to the provision of IFSP’s. Pre-finding notices may be issued to programs with noncompliant records found through these reviews.
- o Further evidence of program performance relative to IFSP development is obtained through 1) the biennial randomly- selected parent survey, 2) the biennial statewide provider survey, and 3) the annual random IFSP review. Due to the change in the family survey used by Kansas, and the improved reliability of that survey, Kansas is reviewing whether the first method mentioned may no longer be necessary.

Kansas ITS proactively addresses IFSP development through the provision of on-going training and technical assistance provided to all EIS programs in face-to-face meetings, by phone or email. In FFY15, all EIS program coordinators met quarterly with staff from the State office and KITS, the state’s technical assistance provider. The Family Service Coordinators were provided IFSP training at their annual meeting, and any service provider can receive direct assistance by calling or emailing the State office or KITS. Formal training of the IFSP will be convened as changes to the form or process are implemented.

Kansas ITS expects this indicator to achieve 100% compliance. Exceptional family circumstances for delayed IFSPs are collected by the ITS database, and should be provided for all IFSPs when services are not provided in a timely manner. Justifications unrelated to exceptional family circumstances, such as staff errors, holiday breaks, and Part C staff scheduling difficulties, are identified by state staff. Such occurrences are a small percentage of the total IFSPs.

The monitoring and noncompliance procedures are part of the publically-available statewide procedure manual, found on the agency’s web site. Additional standardized management reports have been developed using the existing data system, and are available to both the state staff and to local programs for internal review.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As noted in the monitoring plan and noncompliance procedure, revised in September 2014, the state has a documented process which verifies each EIS program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data from the state data system, and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Kansas ITS determines this to be true through the following process:

- o Noncompliance is formally identified and reported through the state’s monitoring process. Most noncompliance is evident through data reports generated from the state’s infant-toddler database, or through the semi-annual report process. In some instances, noncompliance is identified through parent surveys, complaints, local/peer feedback, and related data reports.
- o Following the formal identification and finding, findings letters are issued, generally accompanied by the requirement to enter into a corrective action plan. These plans can include imposition of the submission of monthly reports on changes implemented, the requirement to perform a root cause analysis, and/or submission of new internal policies or procedures to ensure compliance. Kansas ITS monitors a series of subsequent data reports to ensure that the prescribed corrective action is occurring and is effective.
- o After identification of noncompliance, the data for each local program is cross-checked with semi-annual report data, which also identifies specific instances of late IFSP provision.
- o A quarterly review of the infant-toddler database by Kansas ITS staff includes a review of timelines related to the provision of IFSP’s. Pre-finding notices may be issued to programs with noncompliant records found through these reviews.
- o Further evidence of program performance relative to IFSP development is obtained through 1) the biennial randomly- selected parent survey, 2) the biennial statewide provider survey, and 3) the annual random IFSP review. Due to the change in the family survey used by Kansas, and the improved reliability of that survey, Kansas is reviewing whether the first method mentioned may no longer be necessary.

Kansas ITS proactively addresses IFSP development through the provision of on-going training and technical assistance provided to all EIS programs in face-to-face meetings, by phone or email. In FFY15, all EIS program coordinators met quarterly with staff from the State office and KITS, the state’s technical assistance provider. The Family Service Coordinators were provided IFSP training at their annual meeting, and any service provider can receive direct assistance by calling or emailing the State office or KITS. Formal training of the IFSP will be convened as changes to the form or process are implemented.

Kansas ITS expects this indicator to achieve 100% compliance. Exceptional family circumstances for delayed IFSPs are collected by the ITS database, and should be provided for all IFSPs when services are not provided in a timely manner. Justifications unrelated to exceptional family circumstances, such as staff errors, holiday breaks, and Part C staff scheduling difficulties, are identified by state staff. Such occurrences are a small percentage of the total IFSPs.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The monitoring and noncompliance procedures are part of the publically- available statewide procedure manual, found on the agency's web site. Additional standardized management reports have been developed using the existing data system, and are available to both the state staff and to local programs for internal review.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

- Yes
- No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2,755	2,861	100%	100%	100%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	106
--	-----

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data were collected for the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Since the data includes all children served with an active IFSP during the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, this is an accurate reflection of data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for FFY 2015.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Some children referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthday are included in the data provided. Children found eligible for Part C between 45 and 90 days before their third birthday are considered to be potentially eligible for Part B under Kansas' definition, and had transition steps and services written into their IFSP.

Kansas has a digital IFSP which requires all portions to be completed at the time of transition. This digital IFSP is required to be used by all local Part C programs as of July 1, 2016. All programs received an IFSP review of randomly selected IFSPs during the reporting period to check those IFSPs not completed on the digital form for the existence of necessary transition steps and services.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.60%	99.00%	97.90%	99.47%	99.34%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2,673	2,716	99.34%	100%	98.42%

Number of parents who opted out <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	0
---	---

Describe the method used to collect these data

Kansas does not have an opt-out policy for Part B notifications.

Data is from the state's ITS database. All database records for the reporting period are included for children where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the state) to the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides occurred at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services, and less than 9 months prior to the third birthday.

Since Kansas' definition of "potentially eligible for Part B" includes children referred to Part C at least 45 days prior to their third birthday, those children are also included in the above number.

Kansas ITS enjoys a collaborative working relationship with Kansas Department of Education to obtain, analyze and verify data for Indicator 8b.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The data were collected for the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Kansas does not have an opt-out policy for Part B notifications.

Data is from the state's ITS database. All database records for the reporting period are included for children where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the state) to the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides occurred at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

Since Kansas' definition of "potentially eligible for Part B" includes children referred to Part C at least 45 days prior to their third birthday, those children are also included in the above number.

Kansas ITS enjoys a collaborative working relationship with Kansas Department of Education to obtain, analyze and verify data for Indicator 8b.

Since all relevant records for the reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 were included in the review, the data is by definition, an accurate reflection.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Thirteen local tiny-k programs had 43 records where timely Part B referral was not made, but where the child was referred to Part C at least 90 days prior to the third birthday during this reporting period. Findings were issued to all thirteen programs, with either a corrective action plan requirement or a finding and release issued, based on a review of subsequent data from the ITS database. Individual correction was verified on each of the 43 records. This number is an increase from the 16 records found noncompliant in FFY 2014.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
16	16	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

As noted in the monitoring plan and noncompliance procedure, revised in September 2014, the state has a documented process which verifies each EIS program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data from the state data system, and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Kansas ITS determines this to be true through the following process:

- Noncompliance is formally identified and reported through the state's monitoring process. Most noncompliance is evident through data reports generated from the state's infant-toddler database, or through the semi-annual report process. In some instances, noncompliance is identified through parent surveys, complaints, local/peer feedback, and related data reports.
- Following the formal identification and finding, findings letters are issued, generally accompanied by the requirement to enter into a corrective action plan. These plans can include imposition of the submission of monthly reports on changes implemented, the requirement to perform a root cause analysis, and/or submission of new internal policies or procedures to ensure compliance. Kansas ITS monitors a series of subsequent data reports to ensure that the prescribed corrective action is occurring and is effective.
- A quarterly review of the infant-toddler database by Kansas ITS staff includes a review of timelines related to the provision of timely transition planning. Pre-finding notices may be issued to programs with noncompliant records found through these reviews.
- Further evidence of program performance relative to transition planning is obtained through 1) the biennial randomly- selected parent survey, 2) the biennial statewide provider survey, and 3) the annual random IFSP review. Due to the change in the family survey used by Kansas, and the improved reliability of that survey, Kansas is reviewing whether the first method mentioned may no longer be necessary.

Kansas ITS proactively addresses transition processes and requirements through the provision of on-going training and technical assistance provided to all EIS programs in face-to-face meetings, by phone or email. In FFY15, all EIS program coordinators met quarterly with staff from the State office and KITS, the state's technical assistance provider. The Family Service Coordinators were provided transition training at their annual meeting, and any service provider can receive direct assistance by calling or emailing the State office or KITS.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Kansas ITS expects this indicator to achieve 100% compliance.

The monitoring and noncompliance procedures are part of the publically-available statewide procedure manual, found on the agency's web site. Additional standardized management reports have been developed using the existing data system, and are available to both the state staff and to local programs for periodic internal review.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As noted in the monitoring plan and noncompliance procedure, revised in September 2014, the state has a documented process which verifies each EIS program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data from the state data system, and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Kansas ITS determines this to be true through the following process:

- Noncompliance is formally identified and reported through the state's monitoring process. Most noncompliance is evident through data reports generated from the state's infant-toddler database, or through the semi-annual report process. In some instances, noncompliance is identified through parent surveys, complaints, local/peer feedback, and related data reports.
- Following the formal identification and finding, findings letters are issued, generally accompanied by the requirement to enter into a corrective action plan. These plans can include imposition of the submission of monthly reports on changes implemented, the requirement to perform a root cause analysis, and/or submission of new internal policies or procedures to ensure compliance. Kansas ITS monitors a series of subsequent data reports to ensure that the prescribed corrective action is occurring and is effective.
- A quarterly review of the infant-toddler database by Kansas ITS staff includes a review of timelines related to the provision of timely transition planning. Pre-finding notices may be issued to programs with noncompliant records found through these reviews.
- Further evidence of program performance relative to transition planning is obtained through 1) the biennial randomly- selected parent survey, 2) the biennial statewide provider survey, and 3) the annual random IFSP review. Due to the change in the family survey used by Kansas, and the improved reliability of that survey, Kansas is reviewing whether the first method mentioned may no longer be necessary.

Kansas ITS proactively addresses transition processes and requirements through the provision of on-going training and technical assistance provided to all EIS programs in face-to-face meetings, by phone or email. In FFY15, all EIS program coordinators met quarterly with staff from the State office and KITS, the state's technical assistance provider. The Family Service Coordinators were provided transition training at their annual meeting, and any service provider can receive direct assistance by calling or emailing the State office or KITS.

Kansas ITS expects this indicator to achieve 100% compliance.

The monitoring and noncompliance procedures are part of the publically-available statewide procedure manual, found on the agency's web site. Additional standardized management reports have been developed using the existing data system, and are available to both the state staff and to local programs for internal periodic review.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

Required Actions

--

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	42.30%	99.20%	98.30%	98.71%	99.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

- Yes
- No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2,380	2,716	99.70%	100%	99.51%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	89
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	234

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- State monitoring
- State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The data were collected for the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Since all records for the full reporting period of July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 were collected, the results by definition accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for this reporting period.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Of the transition conferences held during this reporting period, 247 of them were held less than 90 days before the child's third birthday. Of these delayed records, 234 had exceptional family circumstance reasons for the delay.

Five tiny-k programs had 13 records where there was a delayed transition conference without an exceptional family circumstance reason. Each program had a finding issued, with either a corrective action plan imposed, or a finding and release issued, depending on the review of subsequent data from the ITS database. Correction of each of the 13 records was verified through a data review.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

As noted in the monitoring plan and noncompliance procedure, revised in September 2014, the state has a documented process which verifies each EIS program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data from the state data system, and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Kansas ITS determines this to be true through the following process:

- Noncompliance is formally identified and reported through the state's monitoring process. Most noncompliance is evident through data reports generated from the state's infant-toddler database, or through the semi-annual report process. In some instances, noncompliance is identified through parent surveys, complaints, local/peer feedback, and related data reports.
- Following the formal identification and finding, findings letters are issued, generally accompanied by the requirement to enter into a corrective action plan. These plans can include imposition of the submission of monthly reports on changes implemented, the requirement to perform a root cause analysis, and/or submission of new internal policies or procedures to ensure compliance. Kansas ITS monitors a series of subsequent data reports to ensure that the prescribed corrective action is occurring and is effective.
- A quarterly review of the infant-toddler database by Kansas ITS staff includes a review of timelines related to the provision of timely transition conferences. Pre-finding notices may be issued to programs with noncompliant records found through these reviews.
- Further evidence of program performance relative to transition processes is obtained through 1) the biennial randomly-selected parent survey, 2) the biennial statewide provider survey, and 3) the annual random IFSP review. Due to the change in the family survey used by Kansas, and the improved reliability of that survey, Kansas is reviewing whether the first method mentioned may no longer be necessary.

Kansas ITS proactively addresses transition processes and requirements through the provision of on-going training and technical assistance provided to all EIS programs in face-to-face meetings, by phone or email. In FFY15, all EIS program coordinators met quarterly with staff from the State office and KITS, the state's technical assistance provider. The Family Service Coordinators were provided transition training at their annual meeting, and any service provider can receive direct assistance by calling or emailing the State office or KITS.

Kansas ITS expects this indicator to achieve 100% compliance. Exceptional family circumstances for delayed transition conferences are collected by the ITS database, and should be provided for all conferences not completed in a timely manner. Justifications unrelated to exceptional family circumstances, such as staff errors, holiday breaks, and Part C staff scheduling difficulties, are identified by state staff and result in issuance of a finding to the local program. Such occurrences are a small percentage of the total transition conferences.

The monitoring and noncompliance procedures are part of the publically-available statewide procedure manual, found on the agency's web site. Additional standardized management reports have been developed using the existing data system, and are available to both the state staff and to local programs for periodic internal review.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

As noted in the monitoring plan and noncompliance procedure, revised in September 2014, the state has a documented process which verifies each EIS program with noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data from the state data system, and has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Kansas ITS determines this to be true through the following process:

- Noncompliance is formally identified and reported through the state's monitoring process. Most noncompliance is evident through data reports generated from the state's infant-toddler database, or through the semi-annual report process. In some instances, noncompliance is identified through parent surveys, complaints, local/peer feedback, and related data reports.
- Following the formal identification and finding, findings letters are issued, generally accompanied by the requirement to enter into a corrective action

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

plan. These plans can include imposition of the submission of monthly reports on changes implemented, the requirement to perform a root cause analysis, and/or submission of new internal policies or procedures to ensure compliance. Kansas ITS monitors a series of subsequent data reports to ensure that the prescribed corrective action is occurring and is effective.

- A quarterly review of the infant-toddler database by Kansas ITS staff includes a review of timelines related to the provision of timely transition conferences. Pre-finding notices may be issued to programs with noncompliant records found through these reviews.
- Further evidence of program performance relative to transition processes is obtained through 1) the biennial randomly- selected parent survey, 2) the biennial statewide provider survey, and 3) the annual random IFSP review. Due to the change in the family survey used by Kansas, and the improved reliability of that survey, Kansas is reviewing whether the first method mentioned may no longer be necessary.

Kansas ITS proactively addresses transition processes and requirements through the provision of on-going training and technical assistance provided to all EIS programs in face-to-face meetings, by phone or email. In FFY15, all EIS program coordinators met quarterly with staff from the State office and KITS, the state's technical assistance provider. The Family Service Coordinators were provided transition training at their annual meeting, and any service provider can receive direct assistance by calling or emailing the State office or KITS.

Kansas ITS expects this indicator to achieve 100% compliance. Exceptional family circumstances for delayed transition conferences are collected by the ITS database, and should be provided for all conferences not completed in a timely manner. Justifications unrelated to exceptional family circumstances, such as staff errors, holiday breaks, and Part C staff scheduling difficulties, are identified by state staff and result in issuance of a finding to the local program. Such occurrences are a small percentage of the total transition conferences.

The monitoring and noncompliance procedures are part of the publically-available statewide procedure manual, found on the agency's web site. Additional standardized management reports have been developed using the existing data system, and are available to both the state staff and to local programs for periodic internal review.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Kansas operates under Part C procedures.

No stakeholder input was necessary for this indicator, due to its inapplicability.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to the State.

Required Actions

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Mediation**

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data					100%						

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

No target has been established for this indicator. Kansas recorded no mediation requests during the applicable reporting period.

Historically, Kansas has had a low number of mediation requests, with none registered during the reporting period. Kansas trained three additional mediators during the early portion of FFY 2013, in order to have a more current list of trained mediators, and has provided other training over the past two years to assist local tiny-k programs in conflict resolution and to educate them on the available mediation process.

Kansas, during the FFY 2010 reporting period, revised the procedural safeguards and due process procedures, along with the public information material. The materials were revised again during the 2011 and 2012 reporting periods to reflect the new Part C regulatory language. These revised procedures utilize the Part C requirements. Specific information on the available processes is included in all revised informational material created for use by parents and the local tiny-k programs. These materials are available on the Kansas ITS web site. The materials outline that a party may request medication at any time by submitting the request to KDHE/ Kansas ITS.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0			

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to having fewer than 10 mediations in any of the past years, this indicator does not require targets to be set.

Kansas does have agreements with the state Department of Administrative Hearings concerning procedural safeguards for Part C, and has provided training for persons agreeing to act as mediators, if any requests are received.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2015. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target		41.55%	42.00%
Data	41.55%	37.57%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	42.25%	42.50%	45.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

To be sent during April 2017

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

To be sent in April 2017.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

To be sent by April 2017

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

To be sent by April 2017.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

Statement

SSIP document to be attached by April 2017.

Description

SSIP document to be attached by April 2017.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

SSIP document to be attached by April 2017.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Infrastructure Development

- Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

See Attached

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

See Attached

Evaluation

- Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

See Attached

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

See Attached

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See Attached

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See Attached

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See Attached

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See Attached

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

See Attached

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See Attached

OSEP Response

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Heather Staab

Title: Director, Infant-Toddler/Part C Services

Email: heather.staab@ks.gov

Phone: 785-296-2245